

Once-Dear Jerry,

12/9/01

The most recent problem caused by your irresponsibilities, stupidities and the like has cost me, thus far, most of \$497 and the cmming trip to the Arch2ves, which has ben medically-prohibites for years. It is what you did and or said when I asked you for the copies of the Zapruder film I ~~gave~~ gave you for Hood many years ago and I now ~~need~~ need. You have held me responsible for all your many mistakes so you can, as you have twisted your mind, hold me responsible for this great irresponsibility.

Years before my going to our basement was ~~prohibited~~ prohibited and when we were both tnere, when we came to the metal cabinet in which I kept all my films not in filex cabinets I gave them to you for Hood and so your students could use them because I was no longer ~~travel~~ing and using them. They included trays of slides, sized for both TV and home uses as well as those I had used in my work, copies of reels of film, including WDSU's and WWLIs, both provided by those stations and made from their originals, odds and ends of other reel films, a number of amateur versions of stolen Zapruders and two profession thefts of it both as good as the best the Commission used, 15 and 35 mm., and others I'm sure I no longer remember.

Several months ago, when the Archives had provided only photographic junk I asked you for them so I could use the 15 and 35 mms. Without taking an instant for reply and thought, you said you do not know where they are. Assuming that to be true, that is a great irresponsibility and the opposite of scholarship. As was giving your answer no thought and not promising to make an effort to get them.. At the time I gave them to you they were worth thousands. They are still of great value. Common decency and scholarship did require the search you do not say you made. It implies what I do not believe, theft.

Lillian Weisberg, who will be 89 in April, and her husband Harold, who will be 89 the month, have had joint bank accounts and investments since slightly before World War II. For most of that time when he needed money, he obtained it from her. She handled all their money. Since she fell down and broke a hip about three years ago, they have had the reverse arrangement, he controls the assets and when she needs finds, he provides them. He also pays her bills that come by mail. This agreement is not intended to change that arrangement in any way. Nor will he in any way deny her any money she needs, as he does not now and has not for these recent years. In practise now it is not wise for him to drive to the bank. The woman who cares for them part-time takes the checks to the bank and gives them the sums of the checks. She also makes all their deposits.

This agreement is intended to prevent errors or mistakes, which in Mrs. Weisberg's condition are now more likely. One cost them more than \$14,000. There almost were two additional ones for about 4,000 each. Mr. Weisberg was able to avoid their being victimized by those frauds.

When Mrs. Weisberg was in the local hospital for the repair of that broken hip, the hospital allowed her to fall again, this time doing more damage. That repaid him was again broken and with that fall in the hospital bathroom, as she went down her head struck solid objects. From that she had two bloody clots on her brain. They were not located until Mrs. Weisberg complained. The hospital then did admit those clots. The surgeon the hospital selected told the not to expect full recovery and that in elderly people there usually is not full mental recovery.

To avoid the possible errors and mistakes from her impaired mental condition Mrs. Weisberg will avoid handling their funds and Mr. Weisberg guaranteeed that he will provide her with all the funds she needs, as he has done without fail since she first broke that hij. He will also continue to pay her bills by mail, as he has done since the. He and she prefer that to protecting their interests by having her dealer incompetent.

13 If you asked Jerry you now know that the Archives can no longer make a photograph, enlarged and the slip they turn out, all that is now available, is worse than useless. And your carelessness, your x concept of scholarship that requires that you do nothing, not even make an inquiry to see if your negligence can be corrected-not even ask a simple question of those who might know where that film is, assures that it will remain suppressed, as will its clear meaning in the evidence.

And you can continue to blame for mistakes that are exclusively yours.

Aside from the totality of the dishonesty, what kind of scholarship is it?

Harold